arXiv:1402.4421v1 [math.GR] 18 Feb 2014

INFINITE SYSTOLIC GROUPS ARE NOT TORSION

TOMASZ PRYTUŁA

Abstract. We study k-systolic complexes introduced by T. Januszkiewicz and J. Świątkowski, which are simply connected simplicial complexes of simplicial nonpositive curvature. Using techniques of filling diagrams we prove that for $k \geq 7$ the 1-skeleton of a k-systolic complex is Gromov hyperbolic. We give an elementary proof of so-called Projection Lemma, which implies contractibility of 6-systolic complexes. We also prove that an infinite group acting geometrically on a 6-systolic complex is not torsion.

Introduction

Simply connected, nonpositively curved metric spaces, called CAT(0) spaces have been intensively studied for over 50 years, and they are one of the major parts of geometric group theory [1].

Because of a theorem by Gromov, the special place among CAT(0) spaces is occupied by CAT(0) cube complexes: a cube complex is CAT(0) if and only if it is simply connected and satisfies an easily checked, local combinatorial condition (links are flag).

Therefore naturally arises the question if there exists a similar characterization for simplicial complexes. A partial answer to that question is the notion of *systolic complexes*. These are simply connected simplicial complexes, whose links also satisfy combinatorial condition called *k-largeness*. This makes them good analogues of CAT(0) cube complexes. This condition may be treated as an upper bound for simplicial curvature around the vertex, hence complexes with k-large links are also called complexes of simplicial nonpositive curvature (SNPC). The k-largeness condition is geometrically motivated by the 2-dimensional case, where systolic complexes actually are CAT(0). In general case SNPC does not imply nor is implied by metric nonpositive curvature.

Systolic complexes were introduced independently by F. Haglund [6] and by J. Świątkowski and T. Januszkiewicz [7], though they were studied earlier by V. Chepoi [2] as *bridged complexes*. Originally they were used to find word-hyperbolic groups of large cohomological dimension, that do not come from isometries of the hyperbolic n-space. However, systolic complexes turned to be an interesting object of study on their own. It has been shown that in many situations systolic complexes behave like CAT(0) spaces, and share many of their properties [7], [9], [4], [5].

Here we mainly focus on analogies between systolic complexes and CAT(0) spaces. Since our paper is self-contained it may be also treated as an introduction to the theory of systolic complexes. Another introductory source is [11].

Let us briefly describe the contents of the paper. In Section 1 we give preliminary definitions and fix the notation, then we pass to Section 2 where we define

k-large and k-systolic complexes, and we introduce combinatorial tools to study these complexes. In Section 3 we prove that 1-skeleton of k-systolic complex is δ-hyperbolic for $k \geq 7$. Proofs in these sections are usually simplified versions of ones in [7], however we include them for integrity of the paper. From Section 4 on our research focuses on the case where $k = 6$. We give an elementary proof of the simplicial version of Cartan–Hadamard Theorem, which states that systolic complexes are contractible. Finally we turn to group theory. In Section 6 we discuss properties of *directed geodesics* and use them in Section 7 to prove that an infinite group that admits a geometric action on a systolic complex, contains an element of infinite order.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Piotr Przytycki for patience, help and guidance, of which he was so full during the year of working on this paper.

1. Notation, basic definitions and combinatorial Gauss–Bonnet

Let X be a simplicial complex. We do not assume that X is finite dimensional nor that it is locally finite. However, when X is finite dimensional, we define its dimension, $\dim X$ to be the largest number n, such that X contains an n-simplex. Most of the time we are interested only in the combinatorial structure of X, only in Section 5 topology of X matters, so let us assume that X has a CW-complex topology.

For vertices $v_0, \dots, v_n$ of X, by $\operatorname{span}\{v_0, \dots, v_n\}$ we denote a subcomplex of X spanned by these vertices. If this subcomplex is a single simplex, we denote it by $[v_0, \dots, v_n]$.

We say X is *flag* if every set of vertices pairwise connected by edges spans a simplex of X.

By a *cycle* in X we understand a subcomplex homeomorphic to S^1. If γ is a cycle, by $|\gamma|$ we denote the number of edges in γ and call it the *length* of γ. A *diagonal* in γ is an edge connecting two nonconsecutive vertices of γ.

A *link* of a vertex v, denoted by X_v, is a subcomplex of X that consists of all simplices $\sigma \in X$ that do not contain v, but that together with v span a simplex of X.

A *simplicial map* $f\colon X \to Y$ between simplicial complexes X and Y is a map, which sends vertices to vertices, and whenever vertices $v_0, \dots, v_k \in X$ span a simplex σ of X, then their images span a simplex τ of Y and we have $f(\sigma) = \tau$. Therefore simplicial map is determined by its values on the vertex set of X. A simplicial map is called *nondegenerate*, if it is injective on each simplex.

Here we introduce the notion of combinatorial curvature and the combinatorial version of Gauss–Bonnet Theorem.

Definition 1.1. Let S be a 2-dimensional triangulated surface, possibly with boundary. For a vertex $v \in S$, by $\angle(v)$ we denote the number of triangles (2-simplices) containing v. Let $\operatorname{int} S$ denote the set of interior vertices of the triangulation of S, and ∂S the set of boundary vertices. Then we define:

- for $v \in \operatorname{int} S$, the *curvature* of v by $\kappa(v) = 6 - \angle(v)$,
- for $v \in \partial S$, the *boundary curvature* of v by $\kappa_\partial(v) = 3 - \angle(v)$.

Theorem 1.2. (Combinatorial Gauss-Bonnet) *Let S be a 2-dimensional compact triangulated surface. Let $\chi(S)$ denote the Euler characteristic of S. Then the following formula holds:*

$$6\chi(S) = \sum_{v\in\partial S} \kappa_\partial(v) + \sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}S} \kappa(v).$$

Proof. We give a proof only in the case when S is homeomorphic to the 2-disc. The proof of a general version can be found in [8, Theorem V.3.1].

We proceed by induction on the number of triangles in S. Since S is contractible, its Euler characteristic is equal to 1. If S is a single triangle $[v_1, v_2, v_3]$, then each v_i is a boundary vertex and we have $\kappa_\partial(v_i) = 2$, hence $\sum_{i=1}^{3} \kappa_\partial(v_i) = 6 = 6\chi(S)$.

Then assume by induction that S satisfies Gauss–Bonnet formula, and add to S an additional triangle. Any triangulation of S can be obtained by adding triangles in the way shown in the Figure 1:



FIGURE 1. Two ways of attaching an additional triangle to the 2-disc.

In situation a) after adding this triangle, the boundary curvature of both v_1 and v_2 decreases by 1. But we have a new vertex v_3 so we have to add to the Gauss–Bonnet sum the boundary curvature of v_3 which equals 2, hence whole sum remains unchanged.

In situation b) the vertex v_3 becomes an interior vertex, so its curvature increases by 3, but now it is contained in one more triangle, hence all together its curvature increases only by 2. The boundary curvature of both v_1 and v_2 again decreases by 1, so the sum still remains unchanged. Then the result follows by induction. □

2. k-largeness condition

In this section we introduce two conditions for simplicial complexes called k-largeness and local k-largeness. The definition is purely combinatorial, but still geometrically inspired by 2-dimensional case. In terms of these conditions we define k-systolic complexes, which are the main objects of our discussion. After defining, we discuss relations between k-large and k-systolic complexes and at the end we give some examples and non-examples of those.

Definition 2.1. Given a natural number $k \geq 4$, a simplicial complex X is *k-large* if it is flag and every cycle of length less than k has a diagonal. We say X is *locally k-large* if links of all vertices of X are k-large.

Observe that if $k \leq m$ then m-largeness implies k-largeness. Now we will show that k-largeness implies local k-largeness. Later we will show that under some additional assumptions the converse also holds.

Lemma 2.2. *Let X be k-large. Then it is locally k-large.*

Proof. Let v_0 be any vertex of X, and γ a cycle of length $m < k$ in X_{v_0}. Then γ is also a cycle in X so it must have a diagonal, call it $[v_1, v_2]$. Since X is flag,

there is a simplex $[v_0, v_1, v_2] \subset X$. Hence the edge $[v_1, v_2]$ belongs to X_{v_0} and is the required diagonal for γ. □

Here we state the converse to Lemma 2.2.

Theorem 2.3. *For $k \geq 6$, let X be simply connected and locally k-large. Then X is k-large.*

In order to prove this theorem, we need to introduce the notion of a *filling diagram*. Filling diagrams together with Gauss–Bonnet Theorem will be our fundamental tools in this paper. Before introducing filling diagrams we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Let X be a k-large complex, $m < k$ and let S^1_m denote the subdivision of the circle into m edges. Then for any simplicial map $f_0 \colon S^1_m \to X$ there exists a simplicial map $f \colon D \to X$, where D is a triangulated 2-disc, such that $\partial D = S^1_m$, $f|_{\partial D} = f_0$ and D has no interior vertices.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on m. If $m = 3$ then we get the required extension, since X is flag. Assume $m > 3$, and label vertices of subdivision of S^1_m by $(v_1, \dots, v_m)$. Then by the fact that X is k-large and that $m < k$, there are two nonconsecutive vertices, say $v_i, v_j \in S^1_m$ with $i < j$, such that their images under f_0 either coincide, or are connected by an edge. Add to S^1_m an edge $[v_i, v_j]$. Then $S^1_m \cup [v_i, v_j]$ is the union of two cycles $S^1_A = (v_1, \dots, v_i, v_j, \dots, v_n)$ and $S^1_B = (v_i, \dots, v_j)$. Note that by the choice of v_i and v_j, the restrictions of f_0 to S^1_A, respectively to S^1_B, denoted by f^A_0, respectively f^B_0 are well defined simplicial maps. Since v_i and v_j are nonconsecutive, both S^1_A, S^1_B are shorter than m, hence by inductive hypothesis we have maps $f^A \colon D_A \to X$ and $f^B \colon D_B \to X$ extending respectively f^A_0 and f^B_0, such that neither D_A nor D_B has an interior vertex. Gluing D_B and D_A along the edge $[v_i, v_j]$, and putting $f = f_A \cup f_B$ gives us the required extension of f_0, and $D = D_A \cup D_B$ has no interior vertices. □

Definition 2.5. Let γ be a cycle in X. A *filling diagram* for γ is a simplicial map $f \colon D \to X$, where D is a triangulated 2-disc, and $f|_{\partial D}$ maps ∂D isomorphically onto γ. A filling diagram $f \colon D \to X$ for γ is called:

- *minimal area* (or *minimal*) if D consists of the least possible number of triangles (2-simplices) among filling diagrams for γ,
- *locally k-large* if D is a locally k-large simplicial complex,
- *nondegenerate* if f is a nondegenerate map.

Remark 2.6. We do not assume that D is a simplicial complex, i.e. it may have multiple edges and loops. However, the diagram can be locally k-large only if D is simplicial, as required in the definition. A simplicial map with D being non-simplicial is defined in the same way as in the simplicial case.

Note that for a simplicial 2-disc, being locally k-large is equivalent to saying that every interior vertex is contained in at least k-triangles.

Theorem 2.7. *Let γ be a homotopically trivial cycle in a locally k-large complex X. Then we have the following:*

1. *there exists a filling diagram for γ,*
2. *any minimal filling diagram for γ is simplicial, locally k-large and nondegenerate.*

Proof. (1) Triangulate S^1 with $|\gamma|$ edges, and define $f_0 \colon S^1 \to X$ as a simplicial isomorphism from S^1 to γ. Then since γ is homotopically trivial, f_0 extends to a map $f \colon D \to X$, such that $f|_{S^1} = f_0$. Using relative Simplicial Approximation Theorem we get that D can be given a triangulation which extends the triangulation of $S^1 = \partial D$ and we get a simplicial map $f_1 \colon D \to X$, which agrees with f_0 on S^1. This proves the existence.

(2) Let $f \colon D \to X$ be a minimal filling diagram for γ. We will show that D is simplicial, locally k-large and nondegenerate.

First we prove that D is simplicial. We have to show that there are no double edges and no loops in D. Assume contrary, that we have two edges e and e' joining vertices v_1 and v_2. Then we can remove a sub-disc bounded by $e \cup e'$, and glue e to e', which gives us a triangulation of D with fewer triangles, together with a simplicial map induced by f. Since X is simplicial, the images of e and e' under f coincide, hence induced map is well defined. This contradicts minimality of D.

Now let us assume that we have a loop in D. Then there exists a maximal loop, i.e. a loop which is not properly contained in the disc bounded by any other loop, call it e. Let D_e denote the disc bounded by e, and let T be the triangle adjacent to e outside D_e. Then we have two possibilities: either two other edges of T are embedded, or they are both loops. Both situations are shown in the Figure 2:



FIGURE 2. Two possibilities for the loop e.

In situation a) two other sides of T have the same endpoints, which is a contradiction with the fact that we do not have double edges. In situation b) the disc bounded by one of the two other sides of T contains e, which contradicts maximality of e.

Now we show that D is locally k-large. We do this by showing that there are no interior vertices of D with $\angle(v) < k$. First observe that in D there are no vertices with $\angle(v) \in \{1, 2\}$. Indeed a vertex v with $\angle(v) = 1$ would force D to have a loop, and a vertex v with $\angle(v) = 2$ would give a loop or two edges with the same endpoints in D.

Assume then that we have a vertex $v \in \text{int}D$ with $3 \leq \angle(v) < k$. Then the link D_v is a cycle of length $\angle(v)$. Consider the map $f|_{D_v} \colon D_v \to X_{f(v)}$, the restriction of f to D_v. It is a simplicial map from a cycle of length $\angle(v) < k$ to the k-large complex X_v, hence by Lemma 2.4 we get a triangulation of a sub-disc D_0 bounded by D_v with no interior vertices, and a simplicial map $f_0 \colon D_0 \to X$, such that f_0 agrees with f on D_v. Thus we can replace the old triangulation of D_0 with the one given by Lemma 2.4, and we define a map f_1 to be f_0 on D_0 and f elsewhere. This yields the filling diagram f_1 for γ with fewer simplices than D, which is a contradiction. Hence D is locally k-large.

The last part is to prove that D is nondegenerate. Assume contrary. Then it folllows that there is an edge e which is mapped by f to a vertex. Take two triangles containing e, delete the interior of their union and glue remaining 4 edges pairwise. Since X is simplicial, the values of f on the glued edges coincide, hence the map induced by gluing is well defined. This results with a smaller diagram for γ. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.3.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. First we show that X satisfies k-largeness condition on cycles, then we show flagness of X. Let γ be a cycle in X with no diagonal. We need to show that $|\gamma| \geq k$. Since X is simply connected, by Theorem 2.7 there exists locally k-large diagram $f\colon D \to X$ for γ. Then we have the following:

- the disc D has at least one interior vertex, because γ has no diagonal,
- interior vertices of D are contained each in at least k triangles, because D is locally k-large,
- boundary vertices are contained each in at least 2 triangles, that is again because there is no diagonal in γ.

In notation from Gauss–Bonnet Theorem, the above conditions give us the following inequalities:

(1) for a vertex $v \in \partial D$ we have $\angle(v) \geq 2$, so $\kappa_\partial(v) \leq 1$, and since $|\partial D| = |\gamma|$, we obtain:
$$\sum_{v\in\partial D} \kappa_\partial(v) \leq \sum_{|\gamma|} 1 = |\gamma|,$$
(2) for a vertex $v \in \mathrm{int}D$ we have $\angle(v) \geq k$, so $\kappa(v) \leq 6-k$, and since $k \geq 6$, all terms $\kappa(v)$ are nonpositive. Because $\mathrm{int}D$ contains at least one vertex, we get:
$$\sum_{v\in\mathrm{int}D} \kappa(v) \leq \sum_{v\in\mathrm{int}D} (6-k) \leq (6-k).$$

Putting (1) and (2) together into Gauss–Bonnet formula gives us:
$$6 = 6\chi(D) = \sum_{v\in\partial D} \kappa_\partial(v) + \sum_{v\in\mathrm{int}D} \kappa(v) \leq |\gamma| + (6-k).$$
Hence $|\gamma| \geq 6 - (6-k) = k$.

Now we show flagness of X. Note that since all links of X are by definition flag, it suffices to show that X^2, the 2-skeleton of X is flag. Indeed, assume that we have the 1-skeleton of an n-simplex $[v_1, \ldots, v_n]$ in X. Then if X^2 is flag, for any vertex v_i we have the 1-skeleton of an $(n-1)$-simplex in X_{v_i}, which by flagness of the link gives an n-simplex $[v_1, \ldots, v_n]$ in X.

To show that X^2 is flag, let (v_1, v_2, v_3) be a cycle of length 3 in X. We need to show that this cycle bounds single 2-simplex of X. The complex X is simply connected, so (v_1, v_2, v_3) is homotopically trivial. Thus by Theorem 2.7 it has a locally k-large filling diagram $f\colon D \to X$. If disc D is a single triangle, we are done, hence let us assume it consists of more triangles. In that case vertices v_1, v_2, v_3 are contained each in at least 2 triangles, hence $\kappa_\partial(v_i) \leq 1$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. For a vertex v in the interior of D, by k-largeness we have $\kappa(v) \leq 0$. Hence applying Gauss–Bonnet we get:
$$6 = 6\chi(D) = \kappa_\partial(v_1) + \kappa_\partial(v_2) + \kappa_\partial(v_3) + \sum_{v\in\mathrm{int}\Delta} \kappa(v) \leq 3.$$

So D must consist precisely of 1 triangle, which means $[v_1, v_2, v_3] \subset X$. □

After this set-up we introduce *systolic complexes*, the main object of our further discussion.

Definition 2.8. Let $k \geq 4$. A simplicial complex X is *k-systolic* if it is locally k-large, connected and simply connected. For $k = 6$ we abbreviate 6-systolic to systolic.

Note that if $k \geq 6$ then Theorem 2.3 implies that a k-systolic complex is k-large, so in particular it is flag. Hence any k-systolic complex is determined by its 1-skeleton. Here we give some basic examples of k-large and k-systolic complexes:

- If X is a graph, then X is k-large if and only if X has no cycle of length less than k, and X is k-systolic if and only if it is a tree,
- Equilaterally triangulated Euclidean plane is systolic (6-systolic),
- Equilaterally triangulated hyperbolic plane, by equilateral triangles with angles $\frac{2\pi}{k}$ is k-systolic,
- For any $k \geq 6$, any triangulation of S^2 is not k-large, hence it is not systolic (by Gauss–Bonnet),
- The locally 6-large triangulation of the torus:



FIGURE 3. The locally 6-large torus. Links are 6-cycles.

- In a similar way for any $g \geq 2$, a closed oriented genus g surface admits a locally 6-large triangulation.

3. 7-systolic complexes are Gromov hyperbolic

The aim of this section is to prove that if X is a 7-systolic complex then X^1, the 1-skeleton of X, with standard metric is Gromov hyperbolic. The standard metric on X^1 is defined as follows: first declare each edge to be isometric to the Euclidean unit interval, then for any two points $x_1, x_2 \in X^1$ define distance between x_1 and x_2 to be the length of a shortest path between them, and denote it by $|x_1, x_2|$. Similarly, the length of a path γ we denote by $|\gamma|$. Although this metric is defined for all points in X^1, most of the time we are interested in distances between vertices, and distance between any two vertices is just the number of edges in the shortest path between them. Note that the length of a cycle defined in Section 1 is exactly its length in X^1-metric. Also note that any simplicial map is 1-Lipschitz with respect to this metric.

Definition 3.1. Let (X, d) be a metric space and $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in X$.

- a *geodesic* joining x_1 to x_2 is an isometry $\gamma : [0, d(x_1, x_2)] \to X$, such that $\gamma(0) = x_1$ and $\gamma(d(x_1, x_2)) = x_2$.
- a space (X, d) is called *geodesic* if every two points of X can be joined by a geodesic.
- a *geodesic triangle* $[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ in X consists of three points and three geodesics joining these points. The images of these geodesics are called the *sides* of this triangle.

Definition 3.2. A geodesic metric space (X, d) is called *δ-hyperbolic* (or *Gromov hyperbolic*) if there exists $\delta > 0$, such that for every geodesic triangle $[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ in X, each side is contained in the union of δ-neighbourhoods of the two other sides.

Remark 3.3. Note that X^1 is a geodesic metric space, where geodesics are precisely the shortest paths between points.

From now on by geodesics we always mean X^1-geodesics (even if we work in X, not X^1) and whenever we refer to metric, we mean X^1-metric.

To prove the main theorem of this section we need a lemma which gives an estimate on the boundary curvature of a geodesic path. Note that the following lemma is true in any simplicial complex.

Lemma 3.4. *Let D be a simplicial 2-disc, and α a geodesic in D contained in ∂D. Then we have:*

$$\sum_{v \in \mathrm{int}\alpha} \kappa_\partial(v) \leq 1,$$

where for a path α, by intα *we denote all vertices of α except for its endpoints.*

Proof. Since α is a geodesic, every vertex of intα is contained in at least two triangles. If not, then part a) of Figure 4 shows that there exists a shortcut. What is more, there cannot be two consecutive vertices each contained in two triangles. If that happens, again there is a shorter path between vertices adjacent to these two, which is shown in part b) of Figure 4. And whenever there are two vertices, each contained in 2 triangles, between them there has to be a vertex contained in at least 4 triangles as in the part c) of Figure 4, otherwise we would be able to find another shortcut. Hence the number of vertices contained in 2 triangles is greater than the number of vertices contained in 4 triangles at most by 1. So $\sum \kappa_\partial(v)$ for these vertices can be at most 1. Since all other vertices are contained in 3 or more triangles, terms $\kappa_\partial(v)$ do not add anything positive to the sum, so the sum remains at most 1. □



FIGURE 4. There are shortcuts in a) and b).

Theorem 3.5. *Let X be a 7-systolic complex. Then X^1 is Gromov hyperbolic.*

Proof. The proof is due to Januszkiewicz and Świątkowski [7, Theorem 2.1]. We need to show that geodesic triangles in X^1 are δ-thin for some $\delta > 0$. First we show that this condition is satisfied by geodesic triangles with vertices in X^0. Note that a geodesic triangle in X^1 can have self-intersections, so it splits into finitely many embedded geodesic bigons and an embedded geodesic triangle, joined by their endpoints or joined by some geodesics between their endpoints.

So to show δ-thinness of any geodesic triangle with vertices in X^0 it is enough to prove that embedded geodesic bigons and embedded geodesic triangles are δ-thin. Let $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$ be a bigon formed by two geodesics α_1 and α_2 with common endpoints. Then since X is simply connected, by Theorem 2.7 there exists a minimal area filling diagram for $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$. Denote this diagram by $f\colon D \to X$. Since f is an isomorphism on ∂D we keep denoting the preimages $f^{-1}(\alpha_i)$ by α_i. Now we work in the disc D. By Lemma 3.4 we have $\sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}\alpha_i} \kappa_\partial(v) \leq 1$ for both α_1 and α_2. For v_0 and v_1, the endpoints of these geodesics, we have $\angle(v_i) \geq 1$ so $\kappa_\partial(v_i) \leq 2$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. And finally by Theorem 2.7 the disc D is locally 7-large, so for the interior vertices we have $\angle(v) \geq 7$, hence $\kappa(v) \leq -1$. Thus by Gauss–Bonnet we get:

$$6 = 6\chi(D) = \kappa_\partial(v_0) + \kappa_\partial(v_1) + \sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}\alpha_1} \kappa_\partial(v) + \sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}\alpha_2} \kappa_\partial(v) + \sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}D} \kappa(v) \leq$$
$$\leq 2 + 2 + 1 + 1 + \sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}D} (-1) = 6 - |\mathrm{int}D|.$$

We have $6 \leq 6 - |\mathrm{int}D|$ so $|\mathrm{int}D| \leq 0$. Thus there are no interior vertices in D, so every vertex of α_1 is connected by an edge to some vertex of α_2. This implies that every point from α_1 is at distance at most $\frac{3}{2}$ from some vertex of α_2 and vice versa, thus ∂D is $\frac{3}{2}$-thin. Then since f is 1-Lipschitz, it cannot increase distances, hence a bigon $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2 \subset X^1$ is also $\frac{3}{2}$-thin.

Now we pass to geodesic triangles. Let $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$ be such a triangle. Pick a minimal diagram $f\colon D \to X$ for $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$. Now ∂D consists of three geodesics: α_1, α_2 and α_3. Using the same estimates as above we get:

$$6 = 6\chi(D) = \kappa_\partial(v_0) + \kappa_\partial(v_1) + \kappa_\partial(v_2) + \sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}\alpha_1} \kappa_\partial(v) +$$
$$+ \sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}\alpha_2} \kappa_\partial(v) + \sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}\alpha_3} \kappa_\partial(v) + \sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}D} \kappa(v) \leq$$
$$\leq 2 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}D} (-1) = 9 - |\mathrm{int}D|.$$

So we have $6 \leq 9 - |\mathrm{int}D|$, hence $|\mathrm{int}D| \leq 3$. There are at most 3 interior vertices in D, thus every point of α_i is at distance at most $4\frac{1}{2}$ from some vertex of $\alpha_j \cup \alpha_k$ where $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. So ∂D seen as a geodesic triangle is $4\frac{1}{2}$-thin. Since f is 1-Lipschitz we get that $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3 \subset X^1$ is also $4\frac{1}{2}$-thin. Thus we proved that geodesic triangles with vertices in X^0 are $4\frac{1}{2}$-thin.

Then it can be shown, that this fact implies that any geodesic triangle in X^1 is δ'-thin, for some other $\delta' > 0$. Indeed, given any geodesic triangle $[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ in X^1 one turns it into a geodesic 6-gon with vertices in X^0, by taking edges containing x_i's to be the new geodesics of length 1. Then one can show that it is δ'-thin by

splitting it into 4 geodesic triangles with vertices in X^0. Detailed proof can be found in [7, Theorem 2.1]. □

4. Projection Lemma for systolic complexes

From now our research focuses only on 6-systolic complexes. Thus we omit 6 and write *systolic*. An important result which we prove in this section, is the *Projection Lemma*. This theorem, first proved by J. Świątkowski and T. Januszkiewicz [7, Lemma 7.7] is an extremely useful tool in working with systolic complexes. Both statement and proof are purely combinatorial: our proof relies on filling diagrams and Gauss–Bonnet Theorem. Before proving the main theorem we need some preparation.

Definition 4.1. Let X be a simplicial complex and σ a simplex of X. We define the *residue* of σ in X, denoted by $\mathrm{Res}(\sigma, X)$ to be a subcomplex of X spanned by all simplices that contain σ.

Definition 4.2. Given a simplicial complex X and a vertex $v_0 \in X$ we define the *combinatorial ball* of radius n centered at v_0 to be:

$$B_n(v_0, X) = \mathrm{span}\{v \in X \mid |v, v_0| \leq n\},$$

and the *combinatorial sphere*:

$$S_n(v_0, X) = \mathrm{span}\{v \in X \mid |v, v_0| = n\}.$$

The idea of the Projection Lemma is to be able to project simplices contained in $S_n(v_0, x)$ onto $S_{n-1}(v_0, X)$ in a somehow nice way.

Theorem 4.3. (Projection Lemma). *Let X be a systolic complex and v_0 a vertex of X. Pick $n > 0$. Then for any simplex $\sigma \subset S_n(v_0, X)$, the intersection $\mathrm{Res}(\sigma, X) \cap S_{n-1}(v_0, X)$ is a non-empty simplex. We call this simplex the projection of σ onto $S_{n-1}(v_0, X)$ and denote it by $\pi_{v_0}(\sigma)$.*

Remark 4.4. If it is clear in what sphere σ is contained, we may also call $\pi_{v_0}(\sigma)$ the projection of σ in the direction of v_0.

Note that since X is flag, the intersection $\mathrm{Res}(\sigma, X) \cap S_{n-1}(v_0, X)$ is spanned by the set of vertices in $S_{n-1}(v_0, X)$ which are connected by an edge to every vertex of σ. So to prove that $\mathrm{Res}(\sigma, X) \cap S_{n-1}(v_0, X)$ is a simplex it is enough to show, that any two vertices from this set are connected by an edge. The proof is quite long so we divide it into few steps. First we prove two lemmas about filling diagrams in systolic complexes, then we show that the projection of σ is a simplex, and at the end that it is non-empty (this is the hardest part).

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ be a geodesic bigon between vertices v_0 and v in a systolic complex X, and let $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = v$. Then $|\gamma_1(1), \gamma_2(1)| \leq 1$, i.e. we have one of the situations appearing in Figure 5.*

Proof. If $\gamma_1(1) = \gamma_2(1)$ then we are in situation a) from Figure 5. So assume $\gamma_1(1) \neq \gamma_2(1)$. We will show that in this case we are in situation b). We can assume that γ_1 and γ_2 do not intersect except at their endpoints, i.e. the bigon $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ is homeomorphic to S^1. If it is not the case, instead of $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ consider the bigon $\gamma_1|_{[0,m]} \cup \gamma_2|_{[0,m]}$, where m is the smallest number such that $\gamma_1(m) = \gamma_2(m)$. By the choice of m, the new bigon is homeomorphic to S^1



FIGURE 5. Distance $|\gamma_1(1), \gamma_2(1)|$ is at most 1.

Since $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ is homeomorphic to S^1, as in the proof of Theorem 3.5 by Theorem 2.7 we have a minimal filling diagram $f\colon D \to X$ for $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$. Since $f|_{\partial D}\colon \partial D \to \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ is an isomorphism, we keep the same notation for preimages of $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ under f, and we apply Gauss–Bonnet Theorem to D:

$$6 = 6\chi(D) = \kappa_\partial(v_0) + \kappa_\partial(v) + \sum_{v \in \mathrm{int}\gamma_1} \kappa_\partial(v) + \sum_{v \in \mathrm{int}\gamma_2} \kappa_\partial(v) + \sum_{v \in \mathrm{int}D} \kappa(v).$$

By Theorem 2.7 disc D is locally 6-large, so we have $\angle(v) \geq 6$ hence $\kappa(v) \leq 0$ for $v \in \mathrm{int}D$. By Lemma 3.4 we get that $\sum_{v \in \mathrm{int}\gamma_i} \kappa_\partial(v) \leq 1$, hence putting this together gives us:

$$\begin{aligned} 6 = 6\chi(D) &\leq 1 + 1 + 3 - \angle(v_0) + 3 - \angle(v) \\ 6 &\leq 8 - (\angle(v_0) + \angle(v)) \\ \angle(v_0) + \angle(v) &\leq 2. \end{aligned}$$

We assumed that $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ is homeomorphic to S^1, hence both $\angle(v_0)$ and $\angle(v)$ are at least 1. So it must be $\angle(v_0) = \angle(v) = 1$, which means $|\gamma_1(1), \gamma_2(1)| = 1$ in D, and since f cannot increase this distance we have $|\gamma_1(1), \gamma_2(1)| = 1$ in X as well. □

The following lemma is very similar and in fact implied by Lemma 4.5.

Lemma 4.6. *Let v_0 be a vertex in X, and $v_1, v_2 \in S_n(v_0, X)$ for some $n > 0$, such that $|v_1, v_2| = 1$. Let γ_i be a geodesic joining v_0 with v_i and $\gamma_i(0) = v_i$. Then either $|\gamma_1(1), \gamma_2(1)| \leq 1$, or $|\gamma_1(1), \gamma_2(1)| = 2$ with the middle vertex v of a geodesic realizing this distance contained in $S_{n-1}(v_0, X)$, and joined by edges to both v_1 and v_2 (see Figure 6).*

Proof. We have a cycle $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2 \cup [v_1, v_2]$. As in the proof of Lemma 4.5 we can assume that this cycle is homeomorphic to S^1. If $\gamma_1(1) = \gamma_2(1)$, then we are in situation a) from Figure 6. So assume $|\gamma_1(1), \gamma_2(1)| \geq 1$. By Theorem 2.7 we can pick a minimal filling diagram $f\colon D \to X$ for $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2 \cup [v_1, v_2]$. Using the same notation and estimates as in the proof of Lemma 4.5, we get that $\kappa(v) \leq 0$ for all v in $\mathrm{int}D$, and $\sum_{v \in \mathrm{int}\gamma_i} \kappa_\partial(v) \leq 1$ for both γ_1 and γ_2, so applying Gauss–Bonnet Theorem we get the following inequalities:



FIGURE 6. Distance $|\gamma_1(1), \gamma_2(1)|$ is at most 2.

$$6 = \sum_{v\in\gamma_1} \kappa_\partial(v) + \sum_{v\in\gamma_2} \kappa_\partial(v) + \sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}D} \kappa(v) \leq 1 + 1 + 3 - \angle(v_0) + 3 - \angle(v_1) + 3 - \angle(v_2)$$
$$6 \leq 2 + 9 - (\angle(v_0) + \angle(v_1) + \angle(v_2))$$
$$\angle(v_0) + \angle(v_1) + \angle(v_2) \leq 5.$$

We have $\angle(v_i) \geq 1$ for $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, because $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2 \cup [v_1, v_2]$ is embedded, hence solving the last inequality we see that either both $\angle(v_1)$ and $\chi(v_2)$ are equal to 2, or at least one of them is equal to 1. Let us consider these two cases:

- $\angle(v_1) = 1$ (or $\angle(v_2) = 1$).
  This means that $\gamma_1(1)$ is connected by an edge to v_2. Then applying Lemma 4.5 to a geodesic bigon formed by γ_2 and $[v_2, \gamma_1(1)] \cup \gamma_1|_{[1,n]}$ we conclude that $|\gamma_1(1), \gamma_2(1)| = 1$ and we are in situation b) in Figure 6.
- $\angle(v_1) = \angle(v_2) = 2$.
  Since both v_1 and v_2 are contained each in two triangles, we easily see that that there exists a vertex v connected by edges to $v_1, v_2, \gamma_1(1)$ and $\gamma_2(1)$. Thus, it only remains to check that $|v, v_0| = n-1$. Clearly $|\gamma_1(1), v_0| = n-1$ and $|v, \gamma_1(1)| = 1$, so $|v_0, v|$ is at most n. On the other hand $|v_1, v_0| = n$ and $|v_1, v| = 1$, so $|v_0, v| \geq n - 1$. Thus we only need to show, that $|v_0, v|$ cannot be equal to n. But if $|v_0, v| = n$ then, again by Lemma 4.5 applied to geodesics $[v, \gamma_1(1)] \cup \gamma_1|_{[1,n]}$ and $[v, \gamma_2(1)] \cup \gamma_2|_{[1,n]}$ we obtain that $\gamma_1(1)$ and $\gamma_2(1)$ are connected by an edge. Hence we are in situation b) in Figure 6. Otherwise $|v, v_0| = n - 1$ and we are in situation c) in Figure 6.

We proved that for the cycle $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2 \cup [v_1, v_2] \subset D$ we have one of the possibilities shown in Figure 6. Since f is simplicial, it cannot increace distances, hence we have the same possibilities for $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2 \cup [v_1, v_2]$ in X. □

Having these two lemmas proved we are ready to prove the Projection Lemma.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. First we prove that for a given $\sigma \subset S_n(v_0, X)$, the projection $\pi_{v_0}(\sigma) \subset S_{n-1}(v_0, X)$ is a simplex. Since X is flag, it is enough to show that any two vertices of the projection are connected by an edge. Take then two such vertices and call them w_1 and w_2. They are in $\pi_{v_0}(\sigma)$, so each of them is connected by an edge to every vertex of σ. So pick any vertex $v \in \sigma$ and consider a geodesic bigon

formed by two geodesics: $[v, w_1] \cup \gamma_1$ and $[v, w_2] \cup \gamma_2$, where γ_i is a geodesic from w_i to v_0. Hence, by Lemma 4.5 we have $|w_1, w_2| \leq 1$, so either $w_1 = w_2$ or they are connected by an edge. This proves that $\pi_{v_0}(\sigma)$ is a simplex.

Now we need to show that $\pi_{v_0}(\sigma)$ is non-empty. We proceed by induction on the dimension of σ. First assume $\dim \sigma = 0$. It means σ is a single vertex $v \in S_n(v_0, X)$. Since X is connected, we can pick a geodesic γ from v to v_0, i.e. $\gamma(0) = v$. Then $\gamma(1) \in S_{n-1}(v_0, X)$ and $\gamma(1) \in \pi_{v_0}(\sigma)$ by definition.

For inductive step let $\dim \sigma = k - 1$ for some $k > 1$ and let $\sigma = [v_1, \ldots, v_k]$. By inductive hypothesis we know that for any codimension 1 face of σ, for example $[v_0, \ldots, v_{k-1}]$, the projection $\pi_{v_0}([v_1, \ldots, v_{k-1}])$ is non-empty. Let $\tau \subset S_{n-1}(v_0, X)$ denote this projection. Then pick any vertex of τ, call it w_1, and choose a geodesic γ_1 from v_{k-1} to v_0 through w_1. Choose also a geodesic γ_2 from v_k to v_0 and denote its vertex consecutive to v_k by w_2. Then we are in the situation of Lemma 4.6, more precisely: vertices v_{k-1} and v_k are in $S_n(v_0, X)$. We have also two geodesics γ_1 and γ_2 from these vertices to v_0, see Figure 7:



FIGURE 7. Inductive step.

Then by Lemma 4.6 we have one of the four following situations:

(i) vertices w_1 and w_2 are equal, so w_1 is connected by edges to all v_i's, hence it belongs to $\pi_{v_0}(\sigma)$.
(ii) there is an edge $[w_2, w_1]$, and an edge $[v_k, w_1]$, then again w_1 is connected by edges to all v_i's,
(iii) there is an edge $[w_2, w_1]$ and an edge $[v_{k-1}, w_2]$,
(iv) there is a new vertex w_3 joined by edges to w_1, w_2, v_{k-1}, v_k.

In cases (i) and (ii) we are done, having $w_1 \in \pi_{v_0}(\sigma)$. The following argument works in the same way for cases (iii) and (iv): in (iii) the vertex w_2 is connected to w_1, v_{k-1} and v_k, in (iv) the vertex w_3 is connected to these vertices. So to simplify, we consider only (iii) remembering that same arguments hold for (iv) where w_3 replaces w_2.

For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, k-2\}$ we have the cycle (v_i, v_k, w_2, w_1). It is a cycle of length 4 and since X is 6-large, by Theorem 2.3 this cycle has a diagonal. Hence for every i we have either edge $[v_i, w_2]$ or $[v_k, w_1]$. If for any i we have edge $[v_k, w_1]$ then we are done, having w_1 connected to all vertices of σ. If not, then for every i we have edge $[v_i, w_2]$. By previous arguments we know that v_{k-1} and v_k are also connected

to w_2. Hence w_2 is in $\pi_{v_0}(\sigma)$. Here we use the fact that by Lemma 4.6 both w_1 and w_2 lie in $S_{n-1}(v_0, X)$, the 'right place' for the projection. Consequently the projection of σ is non-empty. □

5. Contractibility of systolic complexes

Contractibility of systolic complexes follows almost directly from the Projection Lemma. Intuitively Projection Lemma gives us possibility to collapse the complex, projecting simplices onto smaller and smaller balls centered at a certain vertex. In this section we turn this intuition into a proof. Originally this theorem was proved by Januszkiewicz and Świątkowski [7, Theorem 4.1.1].

Theorem 5.1. *A finite dimensional systolic complex is contractible.*

Note that since locally 6-large complexes are supposed to be simplicial analogues of locally $CAT(0)$ spaces, Theorem 5.1 is a simplicial version of the *Cartan–Hadamard Theorem*. The Cartan–Hadamard Theorem states that the universal cover of a nonpositively curved manifold is contractible [1, Theorem II.4.1]. In our situation the universal cover of a locally k-large complex is systolic, hence contractible. Proof of Theorem 5.1 is based on two lemmas: the Projection Lemma and the following.

Lemma 5.2. *Let X be a simplicial complex, and σ a simplex of X. Assume that σ is properly contained in exactly one maximal (with respect to inclusion) simplex τ of X. Then $X - \mathrm{Res}(\sigma, X)$ is a strong deformation retract of X.*

Proof. In case that σ is a codimension 1 face of τ, the required retraction is called the elementary collapse [3, Section I.2]. To prove general case, we construct the required retraction as the composition of finitely many elementary collapses.

Let $\tau' \subset \tau$ be a codimension 1 face of τ such that $\sigma \subset \tau'$. Then consider the set $S = \{\rho \mid \sigma \subset \rho \subset \tau'\}$. This is a partially ordered set with respect to inclusion, hence we can extend this order to a linear order and we get $S = \{\sigma = \rho_0 < \ldots < \rho_n = \tau'\}$. Since $\tau' \subset \tau$ is a codimension 1 face, there is a vertex $v \in \tau$ such that $\tau = \tau' * v$. Then we can perform a sequence of elementary collapses for pairs $\rho_i \subset \rho_i * v$ starting from $i = n$ with the pair $\tau' \subset \tau$, terminating at $i = 0$ with the pair $\sigma = \rho_0 \subset \rho_0 * v$. Indeed, at each step ρ_i is a face of exactly one simplex $\rho_i * v$, because we already removed all other subsimplices of τ which might properly contain ρ_i.

The composition of these elementary collapses is the required deformation retraction: we removed $\mathrm{Res}(\sigma, X)$ because we removed all the simplices ρ_i and $\rho_i * v$ such that $\sigma \subset \rho_i$. □

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Pick any vertex v_0 of X. By Whitehead Theorem, in order to show that X is contractible, it is enough to prove that for any $k \geq 1$, any map $f\colon (S^k, s_0) \to (X, v_0)$ is homotopic to the constant map. The image of S^k is compact, hence it intersects only finitely many simplices of X. Thus it is contained in $B_n(v_0, X)$, for n sufficiently large. We prove that for any n the ball $B_n(v_0, X)$ is contractible. We do it by showing how to homotopy retract $B_n(v_0, X)$ onto $B_{n-1}(v_0, X)$, then the result follows by induction.

Let σ be a maximal simplex in $S_n(v_0, X) \subset B_n(v_0, X)$ and let $m = \dim \sigma$. Then $\sigma * \mathrm{proj}(\sigma)$ is a simplex of $B_n(v_0, X)$ containing σ. We claim that $\sigma * \mathrm{proj}(\sigma)$ is a unique maximal simplex containing σ. To see that, let τ be a simplex of $B_n(v_0, X)$ with $\sigma \subset \tau$. Let v be a vertex of τ which does not belong to σ. Since σ is a maximal

simplex of $S_n(v_0, X)$, vertex v must lie in $S_{n-1}(v_0, X)$. But v is connected by edges to all vertices of σ, so by definition it lies in the projection of σ. Repeating this argument for any such vertex, we finally get that every vertex of τ either belongs to σ or to $\mathrm{proj}(\sigma)$, hence τ is a subsimplex of $\sigma * \mathrm{proj}(\sigma)$. This proves the claim.

Now we see that $\sigma \subset B_n(v_0, X)$ meets the assumptions of Lemma 5.2: it is contained in exactly one maximal simplex of $B_n(v_0, X)$. By Lemma 5.2 the ball $B_n(v_0, X)$ homotopy retracts onto $B_n(v_0, X) - \mathrm{Res}(\sigma, B_n(v_0, X))$. Thus we can apply Lemma 5.2 to all maximal simplices in $S_n(v_0, X)$, and we obtain a complex which is a deformation retract of $B_n(v_0, X)$, where deformation retraction is obtained by performing all retractions arising in Lemma 5.2 simultaneously. Call this complex $B_n(v_0, X)'$, and let $S_n(v_0, X)'$ denote $S_n(v_0, B_n(v_0, X)')$.

We got rid of all maximal simplices of $S_n(v_0, X)$ (removing residue of a simplex removes the simplex itself), thus in $S_n(v_0, X)'$ simplices of dimension $m-1$ are maximal. Hence in the same way as above, we show that any such a simplex is contained in a unique maximal simplex of $B_n(v_0, X)'$ and we can again apply Lemma 5.2. Applying Lemma 5.2 to all maximal simplices in $S_n(v_0, X)'$ we obtain a complex $B_n(v_0, X)''$, with maximal simplices in $S_n(v_0, X)''$ having dimension $m-2$. Continuing this procedure, we finally obtain a complex $B_n(v_0, X)^{(m+1)}$ with no simplices in $S_n(v_0, X)^{(m+1)}$, hence we have $B_n(v_0, X)^{(m+1)} = B_{n-1}(v_0, X)$.

Since every map used in the above procedure was the identity on $B_{n-1}(v_0, X)$, we also get that $B_{n-1}(v_0, X) = B_n(v_0, X)^{(m+1)}$ is a deformation retract of $B_n(v_0, X)$, where deformation retraction is precisely the composition of $m+1$ 'simultaneous retractions' arising in the procedure. Thus we know how to homotopy retract $B_n(v_0, X)$ onto $B_{n-1}(v_0, X)$. By inductive hypothesis $B_{n-1}(v_0, X)$ is contractible, hence so is $B_n(v_0, X)$. □

6. Directed geodesics

In this section we study *directed geodesics*. These are sequences of simplices satisfying some local conditions, which make them behave better than ordinary geodesics in many situations. Originally there were introduced in [7, Definition 9.1]. In our case the main purpose of discussing them is to prove Theorem 7.4. The properties of directed geodesics which we show in this section, namely Theorem 6.3 and Lemma 6.4, were proved in [7, Fact 8.3.2, Lemma 9.3, Lemma 9.6], however our proofs are different and in some way more elementary.

Definition 6.1. A sequence of simplices $(\sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_n)$ in a systolic complex X is called a *directed geodesic* if it satisfies two following conditions:

- *(i)* for any $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ simplices σ_i and σ_{i+1} are disjoint and together span a simplex of X.
- *(ii)* we have $\mathrm{Res}(\sigma_{i+2}, X) \cap B_1(\sigma_i, X) = \sigma_{i+1}$ for any $0 \leq i \leq n-2$.

Here for a simplex σ we define the ball $B_1(\sigma, X)$ to be the simplicial span of the set $\{v \in X \mid |v, \sigma| \leq 1\}$.

Remark 6.2. Above definition is slightly different from the one in [7, Definition 9.1]: in our case direction is reversed, i.e. originally condition (ii) is $\mathrm{Res}(\sigma_i, X) \cap B_1(\sigma_{i+2}, X) = \sigma_{i+1}$. Our modification is needed to avoid notation problems in the construction of infinite directed geodesics.

The following theorem justifies term 'geodesic' arising in Definition 6.1 and is the crucial step in the proof of Theorem 7.4.

Theorem 6.3. *Let $(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_n)$ be a directed geodesic in a systolic complex X. Then any sequence of vertices $(v_0, \dots, v_n)$ such that $v_i \in \sigma_i$, is a geodesic in X^1.*

Proof. First we will show that this condition is satisfied locally, i.e. any triple (v_i, v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}) is a geodesic. Indeed, assume that (v_i, v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}) is not a geodesic, i.e. $|v_i, v_{i+2}| = 1$. This means $v_{i+2} \in B_1(v_i, X)$ but clearly $v_{i+2} \in \mathrm{Res}(\sigma_{i+2}, X)$, hence also $v_{i+2} \in B_1(v_i, X) \cap \mathrm{Res}(\sigma_{i+2}, X)$ which is equal to σ_{i+1} by the definition of a directed geodesic. Hence we get $v_{i+2} \in \sigma_{i+1}$, which contradicts the fact that σ_{i+1} and σ_{i+2} are disjoint. Thus (v_i, v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}) is a geodesic. This fact will be used many times later on.

Note that it is enough to prove that $|v_0, v_n| = n$. Indeed, then any sequence of vertices $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_n$ where $v_i \in \sigma_i$ gives a path from v_0 to v_n of length n, hence a geodesic path.

Note also that if for a geodesic γ from v_0 to v_n we have $\gamma(i) \in \sigma_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, then we are done by induction: assume that the assertion of the theorem holds for any shorter sequence of vertices, then since $\gamma(i) \in \sigma_i$, by inductive hypothesis we have $|v_0, \gamma(i)| = i$ and $|\gamma(i), v_n| = n - i$, hence we get $|v_0, v_n| = n$.

Thus it suffices to show that there is no geodesic from v_0 to v_n, that is disjoint from the $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n-1}$. Assume conversely, that we have such a geodesic and call it γ_0.

Consider the set of cycles $C = \{(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, v_n) \cup \gamma\}$ where $v_i \in \sigma_i$ and γ is a geodesic from v_0 to v_n disjoint from σ_i for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. By our assumption C is non-empty. Any cycle in C is homotopically trivial, hence by Theorem 2.7 it has a locally 6-large filling diagram. Thus we can pick a cycle $(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, v_n) \cup \gamma$ such that its filling diagram $f\colon D \to X$ is minimal among all diagrams for cycles in C.

We would like to apply Gauss–Bonnet Theorem to the diagram D, so we need to find certain curvature estimates. We keep the notation $(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, v_n) \cup \gamma$ for the boundary of D.

- $\sum_{w \in \mathrm{int}\gamma} \kappa_\partial(w) \leq 0$.
  We show that there are no vertices of γ with positive boundary curvature. The proof of Lemma 3.4 gives us that in any geodesic there cannot be vertex w with $\kappa_\partial(w) = 2$. So assume there is a vertex $w_i \in \mathrm{int}\gamma$ with $\kappa_\partial(w_i) = 1$. It means that w_i is contained in two triangles, call them $[w_{i-1}, w_i, w]$ and $[w_{i+1}, w_i, w]$. But then we can replace edges $[w_{i-1}, w_i]$ and $[w_i, w_{i+1}]$ by $[w_{i-1}, w]$ and $[w, w_i]$ obtaining new geodesic γ' and new diagram D' with smaller area, which contradicts minimality od D. Figure 8 shows the replacement procedure.
- $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \kappa_\partial(v_i) \leq 1$.
  First note that there cannot be any vertex v_i, with $\kappa_\partial(v_i) = 2$. In this case v_{i-1} is connected by an edge to v_{i+1} which contradicts the fact that (v_{i-1}, v_i, v_{i+1}) is a geodesic. Then we show that there cannot be two consecutive vertices, each with boundary curvature equal to 1. Assume conversely, that we do have two vertices v_i, v_{i+1} each contained in two triangles (one triangle is common for v_i and v_{i+1}). Call these triangles $[v_{i-1}, v_i, x]$, $[v_i, v_{i+1}, x]$ and $[v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}, x]$. Because $x \notin \sigma_i$ and $x \in B_1(v_{i-1}, X)$ then it must not belong to $\mathrm{Res}(\sigma_{i+1}, X)$. Hence there exists a vertex $w_{i+1} \in \sigma_{i+1}$ which is not connected by an edge to x. But w_{i+1} belongs to σ_{i+1} so by definition of a directed geodesic it is connected to all vertices of both σ_i and



FIGURE 8. Replacement procedure.

σ_{i+2}, so in particular it is connected by an edge to v_{i+2} and to v_i. Hence we have a cycle of length 4, namely $(v_i, x, v_{i+2}, w_{i+1})$. By Theorem 2.3 the complex X is 6-large so this cycle has a diagonal (see Figure 9). By assumption it cannot be $[w_{i+1}, x]$ so it has to be $[v_i, v_{i+2}]$, which contradicts the fact that (v_i, v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}) is a geodesic. Hence, there cannot be two consecutive vertices each with boundary curvature equal to 1.



FIGURE 9. The cycle $(v_i, x, v_{i+2}, w_{i+1})$ has a diagonal.

Next take any vertex v_i with $\kappa_\partial(v_i) = 1$ and assume that $\kappa_\partial(v_{i+1}) = 0$. We then have four triangles: $[v_{i-1}, x, v_i]$, $[v_i, x, v_{i+1}]$, $[x, y, v_{i+1}]$ and $[v_{i+1}, y, v_{i+2}]$. Again, the vertex $x \notin \sigma_i$, so there is a vertex w_{i+1} of σ_{i+1} which is not connected by an edge to x, but is connected to both v_i and v_{i+2}. Thus now we have a cycle $(v_i, x, y, v_{i+2}, w_{i+1})$ of length 5, so it has a diagonal (see Figure 10). It can be neither $[w_{i+1}, x]$ nor $[v_i, v_{i+2}]$. Also it cannot be $[x, v_{i+2}]$ because in that case we would have a cycle of length 4 and two first edges are the only possible diagonals for that cycle. So the only possibility is that we have diagonals $[v_i, y]$ and $[w_{i+1}, y]$. But then we can do the following: replace the vertex v_{i+1} by w_{i+1} and triangles $[v_i, x, v_{i+1}]$, $[x, y, v_{i+1}]$ and $[v_{i+1}, y, v_{i+2}]$ with triangles $[v_i, x, y]$, $[v_i, y, w_{i+1}]$ and $[w_{i+1}, y, v_{i+2}]$, and call the resulting diagram D'. Diagram D' is still minimal, but now we have $\kappa_\partial(v_i) = 0$ and $\kappa_\partial(w_{i+1}) = 1$.



FIGURE 10. Pushing upstairs positive boundary curvature.

So whenever we have a vertex with boundary curvature equal to 1 we can 'push it upstairs' along vertices with curvature equal to 0, till we arrive at a vertex with negative curvature or at v_n. Hence we have $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \kappa_\partial(v_i) \leq 1$.

- $\sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}D} \kappa_\partial(v) \leq 0$.
  Since X is locally 6-large, for any $v \in \mathrm{int}D$ we have $\kappa_\partial(v) \leq 0$.
- $\kappa_\partial(v_0) \leq 2$, $\kappa_\partial(v_n) \leq 2$.
  This follows from the fact that $(v_0, \ldots, v_n) \cup \gamma$ is a cycle.

To finish the argument we put all these inequalities into the Gauss–Bonnet formula:

$$6 = \kappa_\partial(v_0) + \kappa_\partial(v_n) + \sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}D} \kappa_\partial(v) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \kappa_\partial(v_i) + \sum_{v\in \mathrm{int}\gamma} \kappa_\partial(v) \leq 2+2+0+1+0 = 5.$$

We get a contradiction, hence $(v_0, \ldots, v_n)$ is a geodesic. □

Note that the second condition in the definition of a directed geodesic is somehow similar to condition appearing in the Projection Lemma. Using Theorem 6.3 we can make this relation explicit.

Lemma 6.4. *A sequence of simplices $(v_0 = \sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_n)$ in a systolic complex X is a directed geodesic if and only if $\sigma_i \subset S_i(v_0, X)$ is the projection of σ_{i+1} in the direction of v_0 for all appropriate i.*

Proof. First assume that $(v_0, \ldots, \sigma_n)$ is a directed geodesic. Let us recall the definition of the projection of σ_i in the direction v_0, note that by Lemma 6.3 for any i we have $\sigma_i \subset B_i(v_0, X)$, so in particular the projection makes sense:

$$\pi_{v_0}(\sigma_{i+2}) = \mathrm{Res}(\sigma_{i+2}, X) \cap B_{i+1}(v_0, X).$$

And by the definition of a directed geodesic we have:

$$\sigma_{i+1} = \mathrm{Res}(\sigma_{i+2}, X) \cap B_1(\sigma_i, X).$$

We have $\sigma_i \subset S_i(v_0, X)$ so $B_1(\sigma_i, X) \subset B_{i+1}(v_0, X)$, hence $\sigma_{i+1} \subset \pi_{v_0}(\sigma_{i+2})$. We need to show the other inclusion. Assume inductively that for all $0 \leq k \leq i$ we have $\sigma_k = \pi_{v_0}(\sigma_{k+1})$. The projection of a simplex is contained in the projection of any of its faces (follows directly from the definition), so since we have $\sigma_{i+1} \subset \pi_{v_0}(\sigma_{i+2})$, then $\pi_{v_0}(\pi_{v_0}(\sigma_{i+2})) \subset \pi_{v_0}(\sigma_{i+1})$ and the latter equals σ_i by inductive assumption.

Hence $\pi_{v_0}(\sigma_{i+2}) \subset B_1(\sigma_i, X)$ so it is contained in σ_{i+1} by the definition of a directed geodesic. Thus we have $\pi_{v_0}(\sigma_{i+2}) = \sigma_{i+1}$. Clearly for $i = 0$ we have $v_0 = \pi_{v_0}(\sigma_1)$ so claim follows by induction.

To prove the other direction assume $\sigma_k = \pi_{v_0}(\sigma_{k+1})$ for all $0 \leq k \leq n$. Condition (i) of Definition 6.1 is satisfied by the definition of the projection of a simplex, thus we need to prove condition (ii). We have $\sigma_i = \mathrm{Res}(\sigma_{i+1}, X) \cap B_i(v_0, X)$, and we need to show that this is equal to $\mathrm{Res}(\sigma_{i+1}, X) \cap B_1(\sigma_{i-1}, X)$.

By assumption we have $\sigma_{i-1} \subset S_{i-1}(v_0, X)$ so $B_1(\sigma_{i-1}, X) \subset B_i(v_0, X)$, hence we get that $\mathrm{Res}(\sigma_{i+1}, X) \cap B_1(\sigma_{i-1}, X) \subset \mathrm{Res}(\sigma_{i+1}, X) \cap B_i(v_0, X) = \sigma_i$. Conversely $\sigma_{i-1} = \pi_{v_0}(\sigma_i)$ so $\sigma_i \subset B_1(\sigma_{i-1}, X)$, and we get the other inclusion $\sigma_i = \mathrm{Res}(\sigma_{i+1}, X) \cap B_i(v_0, X) \subset \mathrm{Res}(\sigma_{i+1}, X) \cap B_1(\sigma_{i-1}, X)$. Hence $\mathrm{Res}(\sigma_{i+1}, X) \cap B_1(\sigma_{i-1}, X) = \sigma_i$, so triple $(\sigma_{i-1}, \sigma_i, \sigma_{i+1})$ satisfies the condition (ii) of Definition 6.1. This argument works for any $0 \leq i \leq n-2$ hence the claim follows. □

Remark 6.5. There is a more general version of the Projection Lemma, which allows to project also in the direction of a simplex. Lemma 6.4 is then also true if we let σ_0 be any simplex, not necessarily a vertex.

7. Infinite systolic groups are not torsion

Here we turn to studying systolic groups, i.e. groups acting geometrically on systolic complexes. The aim of this section is to prove that an infinite systolic group contains an element of infinite order. This result is true for hyperbolic groups [1, Proposition III.Γ.2.22] as well as for CAT(0) groups [10, Theorem 11]. Our proof is based on the CAT(0) case, but instead of usual geodesics it uses directed geodesics discussed in the previous section. Before proving Theorem 7.4 we show existence of infinite directed geodesics in infinite systolic complexes.

Lemma 7.1. *Let X be a locally finite, infinite systolic complex. Then X contains an infinite directed geodesic.*

Proof. Pick a vertex $v_0 \in X$. We will construct our geodesic to be a sequence of projections onto v_0. Since X is infinite and locally finite, it contains an infinite X^1-geodesic. We can take this geodesic to be issuing from v_0, so in particular for every n, the sphere $S_n(v_0, X)$ is non-empty.

Now consider the set of simplices in $S_1(v_0, X)$, which are projections in the direction of v_0 of some simplices of $S_2(v_0, X)$. Call this set $P(1, 2)$. This set is non-empty, because $S_2(v_0, X)$ is non-empty. Similarly, for any n we define a set $P(1, n)$ to be a set of simplices of $S_1(v_0, X)$ which come from iterating a projection of some simplex of $S_n(v_0, X)$. Again, any such a set is non-empty. Moreover, directly from the definition of these sets we have $P(1, n) \subset P(1, n-1)$. So we have descending family of sets $\{P(1, n)\}_{n>1} \subset S_1(v_0, X)$. Since X is locally finite, the sphere $S_1(v_0, X)$ then is finite, so for N sufficiently large, this family stabilizes, i.e. for any $n \geq N$ we have $P(1, n)$=$P(1, N)$, and obviously $P(1, N)$ is non-empty. Pick any simplex of $P(1, N)$, and call it σ_1.

Now define a set $P(m, n)$ to be a subset of $S_m(v_0, X)$ consisting of simplices which project onto σ_{m-1}, and come from the iterated projection of some simplex of $S_n(v_0, X)$ $(n > m)$. Again, for any m, the family $\{P(m, n)\}_{n>m}$ has the same properties as for $m = 1$, i.e. is non-empty, descending and stabilizes for n sufficiently large. Hence, we can define σ_m to be any simplex of $P(m, N_m)$ where N_m is taken such that $P(m, N_m)$ is 'stable'.

This procedure gives us an infinite sequence of simplices $(v_0, \sigma_1, \ldots)$, which is a directed geodesic by Lemma 6.4, because by construction σ_i is the projection of σ_{i+1} in the direction of v_0. □

Definition 7.2. Let G be a finitely generated group which acts on a topological space X. We say the action is:

- *proper* if for every compact subset $K \subset X$ the set $\{g \in G \mid gK \cap K \neq \emptyset\}$ is finite,
- *cocompact* if there exists a compact subset $K \subset X$ such that $X = GK$.

Definition 7.3. A finitely generated group G is called *systolic* if it acts properly, cocompactly by simplicial automorphisms on a systolic complex X.

Theorem 7.4. *Let G be an infinite systolic group. Then G contains an element of infinite order.*

Proof. We follow the idea of Swenson's proof of an analogous result for CAT(0) groups [10, Theorem 11]. Let X denote the systolic complex on which G acts. Note that because G is infinite and the action is proper and cocompact, the complex X has to be locally finite and infinite. Thus, by Lemma 7.1 we can pick a vertex $v_0 \in X$ and an infinite directed geodesic $(v_0, \sigma_1, \ldots)$. We denote this geodesic by γ. We will use γ to construct an element of infinite order.

Pick any sequence (σ_k) of disjoint simplices of γ. We will be modifying this sequence by passing to a subsequence many times, which we will view as restricting the indices to the set I for some $I \subset \mathbb{N}$. First note that since the action is cocompact, any simplex of (σ_k) is in a translate of a compact set K. The set K contains finitely many simplices, hence there are only finitely many possible values of $\dim \sigma_k$. Thus one particular dimension d_0 appears in (σ_k) infinitely many times, and we take a subsequence $(\sigma_k)_{k\in I}$ such that $\dim \sigma_k = d_0$. Again by cocompactness, for every σ_k there exists $g_k \in G$ such that $g_k(\sigma_k) \subset K$. Since K is compact, there is a subsequence of $g_k(\sigma_k)$ which converges to some simplex $\tau_0 \subset K$. Because G acts by simplicial automorphisms, for k sufficiently large we have $g_k(\sigma_k) = \tau_0$.

Next, for every σ_k we look at simplices σ_{k-1} and σ_{k+1}. Again we have only finitely many possibilities for each of their dimensions, hence we can pass to a subsequence $(\sigma_k)_{k\in I}$ such that for every k we have $\dim \sigma_{k-1} = d_{-1}$ and $\dim \sigma_{k+1} = d_1$. We have $\{\sigma_{k-1}, \sigma_{k+1}\} \in B_1(\sigma_k, X)$, so also $\{g_k(\sigma_{k-1}), g_k(\sigma_{k+1})\} \in B_1(\tau_0, X)$. The ball $B_1(\tau_0, X)$ is compact, thus passing to a subsequence we get that $g_k(\sigma_{k-1}) \to \tau_{-1}$ and $g_k(\sigma_{k+1}) \to \tau_1$ for some simplices τ_{-1} and τ_1 contained in $B_1(\tau_0, X)$. So taking k sufficiently large we obtain $g_k(\sigma_{k-1}, \sigma_k, \sigma_{k+1}) = (\tau_{-1}, \tau_0, \tau_1)$.

Having (σ_k) modified that much, we are ready to construct desired element. Take $l > k$ such that g_k and g_l both satisfy the above condition, i.e. $g_k(\sigma_{k-1}, \sigma_k, \sigma_{k+1}) = g_l(\sigma_{l-1}, \sigma_l, \sigma_{l+1}) = (\tau_{-1}, \tau_0, \tau_1)$, and consider the element $h = g_l^{-1} g_k$. We claim h is of infinite order.

Indeed, the sequence $(\sigma_k, \ldots, \sigma_l) \subset \gamma$ is a directed geodesic, and so is the sequence $(h(\sigma_k), \ldots, h(\sigma_l))$, because h is an X^1-isometry. Now consider the concatenation of these two. By construction of h we have $(h(\sigma_{k-1}), h(\sigma_k), h(\sigma_{k+1})) = (\sigma_{l-1}, \sigma_l, \sigma_{l+1})$, hence $(\sigma_{k-1}, \ldots, \sigma_{l+1})$ and $(h(\sigma_{k-1}), \ldots, h(\sigma_{l+1}))$ intersect at three simplices. That is enough for $(\sigma_k, \ldots, \sigma_l = h(\sigma_k), \ldots, h(\sigma_l))$ to be a directed geodesic, because the condition defining directed geodesic involves checking triples of consecutive simplices, and every triple in the concatenation is either contained in

$(\sigma_{k-1}, \ldots, \sigma_{l+1})$ or $(h(\sigma_{k-1}), \ldots, h(\sigma_{l+1}))$. Iterating this procedure shows that for any $n > 0$ the concatenation of $(h^m(\sigma_k), \ldots, h^m(\sigma_l))$ for $m = 1$ to n is a directed geodesic.

To finish the argument, assume that $h^n = e$ for some $n > 0$. In particular this means $h^n(\sigma_k) = \sigma_k$, which in a view of Theorem 6.3 contradicts the fact that $(\sigma_k, \ldots, h^n(\sigma_k))$ is a directed geodesic. □

References

1. Bridson, Martin R. and Haefliger, André. Metric spaces of non-positive curvature, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1999).
2. Chepoi, Victor. Graphs of some CAT(0) complexes. *Advances in Applied Mathematics* **24** (2000), 125–179.
3. Cohen, Marshall M. A course in simple-homotopy theory. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 10, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1973).
4. Elsner, Tomasz. Flats and the flat torus theorem in systolic spaces, *Geometry & Topology* **13** (2009), 661–698.
5. Elsner, Tomasz. Isometries of systolic spaces, *Fundamenta mathematicae* **204** (2009), 39–55.
6. Haglund, Frédéric. Complexes simpliciaux hyperboliques de grande dimension, *Prepublication Orsay* **71** (2003).
7. Januszkiewicz, Tadeusz and Świątkowski, Jacek. Simplicial nonpositive curvature, *Publications Mathématiques de l'Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques* **104** (2006), 1–85.
8. Lyndon, Roger C. and Schupp, Paul E. Combinatorial group theory. Classics in Mathematics, reprint of the 1977 edition, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2001).
9. Przytycki, Piotr. Systolic groups acting on complexes with no flats are word-hyperbolic, *Fundamenta mathematicae* **193** (2007), 277–283.
10. Swenson, Eric L. A cut point theorem for CAT(0) groups, *Journal of Differential Geometry* **53** (1999), 327–358.
11. Świątkowski, Jacek. Notes from the mini-course on Simplicial Nonpositive Curvature, Montreal (2006).

University of Copenhagen, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Universitetsparken 5, 2100 Ø Copenhagen, Denmark

E-mail address: t.prytula@math.ku.dk